

SOUTH DAVIS COUNTY TRANSIT DEIS North Salt Lake Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3 - Summary

Project: Meeting Purpose:

South Davis County Transit DEIS North Salt Lake Sub-Committee Meeting No. 3

Meeting Location:

9:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m. North Salt Lake Public Works

August 28, 2007

<u>Attendee</u> <u>Representing</u>

Angelo Papastamos UDOT Kerry Doane UTA Kim Clark VIA

Jacqueline Jensen
Saffron Capson
Colleen Lavery
Robin Hutcheson
Kyle Cook
Jonathan Larsen
Jon Nepstad
H.W. Lochner
Carter & Burgess
Fehr & Peer
Fehr & Peers
Fehr & Peers
Fehr & Peers
Fehr & Peers

Blaine Gehring (representative)

Conrad Jacobson

Sub-Committee member

Sub-Committee member

Sub-Committee member

Sub-Committee member

Meeting Summary:

Process

K. Clark began by explaining where the project currently is in the overall process. She indicated alternatives for the project are currently being evaluated. Input from the next round of sub-committee meetings will be used to accomplish this task. During the next regional workshop attendees will focus specifically on alignments. During the current meeting the focus will be on alternative modes. The Purpose and Need Statement for the study was reviewed with the group. Sub-committee members were referred to their meeting packets for full text copies of all of the meeting materials..

Regional Workshop Recap

K. Clark recapped the exercise conducted at the second Regional Workshop which focused on origins/destinations, alignments, and the identification of modes. A map of the primary and secondary alignments identified at the Regional Workshop was shown to the group.

Universe of Alternatives

K. Clark explained what the "universe of alternatives" entailed and the Universe of Alignments map was shown. Sub-committee members were then taken through the two components to an alternative (alignment and mode).

Alignments

A map of preliminary alignments being taken through the alternatives analysis process was shown to sub-committee members as the study's preliminary "long list alignments." K. Clark reviewed the criteria used to narrow down alignments.

Modes

Next, a "universe of modes" list was reviewed with the sub-committee members. As with alignment narrowing criteria, mode narrowing criteria was discussed. The preliminary "long list of modes" was outlined by K. Clark. The list was divided into two categories – bus and rail.

Factors to Consider

K. Clark defined factors to consider when comparing modes. Factors included market, capacity, operating characteristics, costs, environmental/community considerations, and access. After each factor was reviewed, a "dot game" exercise was conducted to determine which three factors are most important to each sub-committee member in considering modes. The following is a list of factors identified by the North Salt Lake sub-committee members as most important when considering modes:

| Category | Factors | Number of Dots |
|--|---|----------------|
| Market | Local trips are important. | .5 |
| Warket | Commuter trips are important. | 1.5 |
| Capacity | | 0 |
| Operating Characteristics | It should stop frequently. | 1 |
| | It should stop less frequently, and go faster. | 0 |
| Costs | | 1 |
| Environmental/Community Considerations | It needs to sit within the context of my community. | 1.5 |
| Considerations | It needs to allow for good traffic flow. | .5 |
| Access | It needs to be easy to board. | 0 |
| | I need to be able to get to it easily. | 3 |

Long List Modes

R. Hutcheson outlined each mode in the preliminary long list of modes, including giving a description and typical characteristics based on how the mode has been implemented in other communities in the United States. After each mode was discussed, the group participated in an exercise to determine the "pros" and "cons" of implementing each mode in their community. Below is a list of pros and cons identified by North Salt Lake sub-committee members.

| BUS (0 Dots) | | |
|--------------|---|--|
| Pro | Con | |
| | UTA history – late, inconvenient, transfers | |

| BRT – Bus Rapid Transit (2 Dots – Mid-level BRT) | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Pro | Con | | |
| Makes more frequent stops | Potential right-of-way issues | | |
| Flexibility | | | |

| LRT – Light Rail Transit (0 Dots) | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Pro | Con | |
| | Right-of-way issues in North Salt Lake – impacts | |
| | Cost prohibitive | |

| Streetcar (0 Dots) | | |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Pro | Con | |
| Provides local service | Potential right-of-way issues | |
| Flexibility – runs with traffic | | |

| DMU – Diesel Mobile Unit (1 Dot) | | |
|--|--|--|
| Pro | Con | |
| Enhanced service for North Salt Lake commuters | Cost if new track is built | |
| | Distance between stations – limited locations for potential stops in North Salt Lake | |

Notes: The North Salt Lake sub-committee discussed using a van and shuttle system. Potential alternative stops using 400 West, 700 West, and Redwood Road may help cover the Industrial Area. The alternative needs to serve the west side. It was noted that Redwood Road is too far east for Foxboro.

Future Meetings

The next sub-committee meeting will be held on October 16th from 9:00–11:00 s.m.

Any discrepancies with this meeting summary, please notify Jacqueline Jensen.

Cc: Attendees, Project Contact List, North Salt Lake Sub-Committee Members